EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Kenneth Ouellette Investigations LLC was employed by Meridian Township, Michigan to conduct a review of the Meridian Township Police Department’s handling of a Criminal Sexual Conduct investigation filed on September 16, 2004 by victim Brianne Randall. The case was briefly investigated and closed on October 1, 2004 without being sent to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review. Brianne Randall, also referred to in this document as victim, believed there was a mishandling of how this case was investigated.

As a result of the victim’s concerns, the Meridian Township Board agreed to pay for an independent investigation by an investigator of the victim’s choice to answer her questions. Kenneth Ouellette Investigations LLC was hired to conduct the independent investigation. As a result, Kenneth Ouellette Investigations LLC requested the client provide a list of specific concerns or questions she desired to have answered. The client produced a document containing ten questions for review and investigation. In addition to the questions, the client and township wanted an understanding as to what transpired for two reasons. The first was for the client, to have her questions and concerns answered so as to continue her healing process, and secondly for the township to learn what went wrong, in efforts to learn from it and to ensure similar issues do not occur in the future.

After reviewing the ten questions, a request was made through Township Manager Frank Walsh for documents needed to properly investigate and to assist in obtaining answers for the client. Once those documents were received and reviewed, non-recorded interviews were set with those identified as potentially being involved. It was hoped that as a result of the interviews, a better understanding would be gained as to why the failure(s) occurred. During this process, approximately ten interviews took place along with numerous phone calls. In some cases, witnesses were re-contacted for follow-up questions that came up as a result of other interviews.

All but two individuals agreed to be interviewed who were requested to do so. One employee contacted by phone, who was retired, respectfully declined to be interviewed. The other individual, also retired, never returned this investigator’s call.

During the investigation several very basic questions were identified:
- Why didn’t the detective forward the investigation to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review prior to being closed?
- Why did the detective not pursue basic investigative and interview/interrogation procedures and techniques when evaluating Larry Nassar’s veracity?
- Why was Larry Nassar’s statement not challenged in efforts to bring out what he actually did during his “medical procedure”?
- Why didn’t the detective communicate with his direct supervisor, nor vice-versa, about the case before, during, or after the investigation?
- After his review, why did the detective’s immediate supervisor concur with the closing of the case and fail to request the case be sent to the prosecutor’s office?
- Why was the report denied to the victim until after Larry Nassar was sentenced?
This report has been organized relative to the document submitted by the client with questions and according to the question numbers listed on that document. The supporting documentation for the answers to questions, has been attached with the question being answered.

During this investigation, Brianne Randall, Meridian Township Manager Frank Walsh, Meridian Township Police Department personnel, and all Meridian Township Staff provided the requested information in a professional and timely manner.

It should be clear, this investigation focused only on the complaint filed by Brianne Randall on September 17, 2004 and how it was handled.

In conclusion, it is believed those concerns and questions by both the client and the township were answered.
Hello,

As requested by Ken, I have prepared a letter with specifics of issues I wanted addressed in this investigation. I was asked to have this in letter format. Please see attached document. Let me know if you need this in a different format or anything else. Thank you both again for your help!

Bree Randall PA-C
To Ken,

Thank you for agreeing to conduct the independent investigation on my report made to the Meridian Township Police Department in 2002. I would like to start by saying that my intent of this investigation is not to find fault in the Township or individuals within the Department. My goal is to gain an understanding of what transpired in my case so that I can continue my healing process. While the Township has provided me with some information on the errors that were made, there are still several unanswered questions that I have. I request that you investigate the following items:

1. Was there any other documentation or evidence that was submitted to Detective McCready outside of the PowerPoint that was included in the police report?
2. Where and when did Detective McCready interview Larry Nassar? Is there any audio or other records related to this meeting?
3. Why did Detective McCready not consult another medical expert or perform any investigation on Larry Nassar’s explanation of his “procedure”?
4. Is there any record of a meeting with Detective McCready, my parents and Larry Nassar?
5. Why was the meeting between Detective McCready, my parents and Larry Nassar not documented in the police report?
6. Why was my case not forwarded to the Prosecutors Office? Was it standard procedure at this time for cases like mine not to be forwarded to the Prosecutors Office?
7. Who oversaw Detective McCready’s work? Is there any documentation of this? If there is not documentation of this oversight, why?
8. Why was I denied a copy of my police report when I requested it on September 13, 2016 and why was it continually denied until January 2018, long after the investigation was concluded and Larry Nassar had entered a guilty plea?
9. If at any point the Attorney General or Ingham County Prosecutor’s office informed Meridian not to release my records, when was this done and to whom did they specifically instruct them not to release to? Was the restriction of releasing this record intended for me, the public or both?
10. What were the findings of the internal investigation of my case? Was there a report of this investigation?

Thank you again for your assistance, I look forward to gaining some closure on this matter:

Sincerely,

Brianne Randall-Gay
QUESTION #1

WAS THERE ANY OTHER DOCUMENTATION OR EVIDENCE SUBMITTED TO DETECTIVE MCCREADY OUTSIDE OF THE POWERPOINT THAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE POLICE REPORT?

At the beginning of this investigation, the complete and non-redacted police report was requested through Meridian Township Manager Frank Walsh for this investigation. The report was turned over for review. Mr. Walsh indicated the report he provided to this investigator was turned over to him by Chief Plaga. This investigator was assured by both Manager Walsh and the Chief that the entire report from the Meridian Township Police Department was turned over for this investigation. In a subsequent interview with Chief Plaga, it was learned the investigative file, or the work copy, was destroyed after three years as part of policy. Therefore, no hand written notes, personal communications etc. are in the file. The original file with supplemental reports remains, except lawful redactions. See attached Meridian Township Police Report, # 04-18086.

The contents of the report turned over to this investigation for examination include:

- Original report # 04-18086, taken by Officer Paul Rambo on September 17, 2004. Included in the original report was basic information, a three page typewritten report documenting the victim’s account of what occurred.
- A copy of the Michigan Medical Forensic Examination Record, commonly referred to as the Sexual Assault Kit Report, completed by Sparrow Hospital, the Examining Agency. NOTE: This document was received from the Meridian Township Police Records Bureau for this investigation. The report is protected under FOIA therefore is not attached.
- Four page follow-up investigation completed by Detective Mccready. The follow-up investigation includes: interview with the victim, contact and interview with suspect Larry Nassar and interview with the victim’s mother, Ellen Speckman-Randall.
- 26 Page PowerPoint presentation, authored and provided by Larry Nassar for the investigation. (Date provided to the original investigation is unknown.)
- Both Detective McCready and Detective Crane acknowledge the suspect provided unknown written material to validate and support his position regarding the procedure and its need. This information was not reviewed in detail by either of the detectives, nor was it retained for further investigative purposes. The written material was turned back over to the suspect on an undocumented date; therefore, the material is not available for examination for this investigation.

*In addition to the above referenced material, more documents are included in the report. The items listed above are more directly related to the core information used for the investigation of Randall’s complaint. The additional documents not listed above but contained in this report include, but are not limited to, evidence sheets and logs, computer printouts for tracking purposes, case management documents and witness information.
### Meridian Township Police Department

**Incident Report**

**Nature of Incident — Include Code(s):** CSC 1 175

**Location (Business or Common Name, Address, Intersection):** 2900 HANNAH BLVD # 104

**Reporting Officer (Name and CAD #):** RAMBO 543

**Additional Officers (Names and CAD #):** TOBIAS 738

---

**Attempt** ☑  
**Location Site:** 09  
**Alleged Drug:** ☑  
**Arrest:** ☑  
**Cited:** ☑  
**Other:** ☑  

**Weapon:** 00  

**Incident Report**

**Attempt to Complete** ☑  
**Method of Entry** ☑  
**Occurred On Or Between** ☑  
**Time:** 0810  
**Day/Date:** 0916/04  
**Day/Date:** 0916/04  
**Time:** 0910  

**Person Type** ☑  
**CSC**  
**Victim of CSC** ☑  
**Suspect** ☑  
**Arrest** ☑  
**Cited** ☑  
**Other** ☑  
**Location:** ☑  
**Addres:**  
**Name:** RANDALL BRITANN PATRICIA

**City:** HASLETT  
**State:** MI  
**Zip:** 48840

**City:**  
**State:**  
**Zip:**

**Sex:** ☑  
**DOB:** ☑  
**Ht:** ☑  
**Wgt:** ☑  
**Eyes:** ☑  
**Hair:** ☑  
**Skin:** ☑  
**Bld:** ☑  
**Photo:** ☑  
**Fingerprints:** ☑  
**Arrest Arrested:** ☑  
**Date/Time:** 

**Relationship:** SPARROW RN | SEXUAL ASSAULT PROGRAM COORDINATOR

**Date:** 2019  
**City:** LANSING  
**State:** MI  
**Zip:** 48909

**City:**  
**State:**  
**Zip:**

**Property:** ☑  
**Stolen and Recovered** ☑  
**Stolen** ☑  
**Recovered** ☑  
**Destroyed/Damaged/Vandalized** ☑  
**Burned** ☑  
**Counterfeit/Forged** ☑  
**Seized** ☑  
**Other or Unlc**

**Stolen Item:**

**Brand:**

**Model:**

**Color 1:**

**Serial #:**

**Misc Description:**

**Owner:** (1,5cm)  
**Address:**  
**City:**  
**State:**  
**Zip:**

**Telephone:**

**Date/Time Recov:**

**Recovered Dispo:**

**Recovered:**

**Estimated Damage:**

**Suspect Described:** (2)

**Suspect Named:** (2)

**Tracing Property:** (2)

**Limited Opportunity for Another:** (2)

**Suspect Identified:** (2)

**Suspect Previously Seen:** (2)

**Significant MO:** (2)

**Significant Circumstances:**

**Total:** 18

---

**Victim rights information delivered to:** RANDALL BRITANN  
**by:** P. RAMBO # 7523

**Follow-up assigned to:** 

**Date:**

**Reviewed by:**

**White: Records**

**Yellow: Investigations**

**Patrol:**

---

**Severity Factors Completed by Supervisor:**

- Reliable Witness (3)
- Suspect Location (2)
- Vehicle Description (2)
- Usable Physical Evidence (1)
- Suspect Described (2)
- Suspect Named (2)
- Traceable Property (1)
- Limited Opportunity for Another (3)
- Suspect Identified (2)
- Significant MO (1)
- Exceptional Circumstances

---

**Follow-up:**

**by:**

**Date:**

**Reviewed by:**

**White: Records**

**Yellow: Investigations**

**Patrol:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Type</th>
<th>[ ] Compl</th>
<th>[ ] Victim of</th>
<th>[ ] Suspect</th>
<th>[ ] Arrest</th>
<th>[ ] Cred</th>
<th>[ ] Missing</th>
<th>[ ] Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Name (L,Cn)</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>Home Tx</td>
<td>Work/Other Tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Name (L,Cn)</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>Home Tx</td>
<td>Work/Other Tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Name (L,Cn)</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>Home Tx</td>
<td>Work/Other Tx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Sex' column includes the following fields: 
- Race 
- DOB
- Hair
- Wgt
- Eyes
- Hair
- Skin
- Bld

'Social Security' includes: 
- SID#
- FBI#
- DLA/State

'State' includes: 
- Birthplace
- V Type 28
- Domestic
- Photo
- Print
- Arrest Armed

'City' includes: 
- Arrest Type 40
- Arrest Date/Time
- Charge(s)

'Victim rights information delivered to' by

Submitted by Rambo S3. Follow-up assigned to by Date due Review by

M.003-10-02 White: Records Yellow: Investigations Pink: Patrol
Meridian Township Police Department  
Narrative Report

Incident Number: 04-18086
Report Date: 09/17/04

Information
On 09/17/04 Brianne Randall came to MTPD to make a CSC report. She is 17 years old. She was accompanied by her mother, [Redacted].

Statement Brianne Randall
Randall stated that about 2-3 months ago she went to the doctor due to a scoliosis condition. She went to Dr. Lawrence Nassar in the Michigan Athletic Club building. Randall’s mother accompanied her to this appointment.
At the appointment she was provided with a gown and shorts to wear during the appointment. Nassar did what appeared to be routine testing for things such as strength and flexibility. Nassar then referred her to physical therapy.
At this appointment, with Randall’s mother still present, Nassar asked Randall for a hug.
There was a medical student present during this appointment.

Physical Therapy
Randall was delayed in starting physical therapy, due to the caseload where she was referred. About one month ago she started therapy at “Rebound” on Jolly Rd in Lansing. She has been going about two times per week since then. At therapy she has been doing strength training and exercises. Often at the end of a session the therapist will perform soft tissue massage on Randall.
The only areas of Randall’s body that the massage has been performed on are her lower and upper back. If only her lower back is going to be massaged, the therapist will not have Randall don a gown. The therapist will just pull the back of Randall’s shirt up a little bit. If her upper back is going to be massaged, the therapist will have Randall don a gown. The therapist will then open the back of the gown, only exposing Randall’s back. During the massages, Randall will either be lying on her stomach or sitting in a chair. The massages usually last up to about 15 minutes.
No other part of Randall’s body has ever been massaged or touched by the therapist at any time. The therapist has never talked to Randall about relieving pressure in her back or other areas by massaging other parts of Randall’s body.

Submitted by: [Signature]
Check-up with Dr. Nassar 09/16/04
On 09/16/04 Randall had an appointment with Nassar. The appointment was a check-up to see how she was doing after having gone to therapy for a while. The appointment was for 8:00am, and Randall arrived at 8:10am. Randall went to this appointment alone.

Randall and Nassar were the only ones in the room during the check-up examination. Nassar began by doing the same type things he had done at the original appointment 2-3 months ago. He checked such things as strength and flexibility. He then said that Randall’s back felt tight. He gave Randall a gown and shorts to change in to. The shorts had Velcro type sides on them. Nassar left the room while Randall changed in to the gown and shorts. Nassar returned, and had Randall lay on her stomach for a soft tissue massage.

Nassar began by massaging her back, all along her spine. He then moved to her “butt.” He “ripped” the Velcro type attachment open on the side of the shorts. Randall had her underwear on under the shorts. Nassar said something to the effect of, “This might give you a wedgie.” He was massaging her buttocks. He pulled her underwear down on one side, totally exposing that side of her buttocks. He then moved his hand to her, “crotch area.” While massaging her back, he began pressing on the outer area all along her vagina. His hand was directly on her bare vagina. He told her this would relieve the tension in her back and buttocks. He was pressing hard on her vagina, and it hurt Randall. He asked her if she was “ok with this” and if it hurt. She said it did not hurt, even though it did. She said that he could tell that it did hurt. He was trying to put his finger in her vagina. She had a tampon in her vagina, and she said that she could tell that he could tell that it was there. She felt that he was not able to put his finger in her because of the tampon. She said that he did not penetrate her vagina, but he was definitely trying. He continued to massage her back and her crotch, including the outer area of her vagina, for about 20 minutes. He then moved his hands. She was still lying on her stomach. While rubbing her neck, he reached under her, under her gown, and placed his hand on her bare breasts. He was “rubbing around” and “squeezing” her breasts. He told her that this would also relieve the tension in her back and buttocks. He continued this for about 10-15 minutes.

He then stopped. He turned around to take notes. She was trying to reattach the side of the shorts, trying to “cover up.” He asked her if she needed any help, and she said no. He said he would turn around while she put her pants on. She put her pants on. She still had the gown on, and did not have a bra on underneath. He said to put her shirt on real quick, and he would make another appointment for her.

Submitted by: Officer Paul Romano
Incident Number: 04-18086

Report Date: 09/17/04

She turned away and put her shirt on. He said he wanted to see her once a week for a while, for about an hour per visit. He made several appointments for her. He then asked her for a hug. Randall then went out to see one of the office staff. Nassar had forgotten to give her the appointment sheet. The office lady said they needed to make appointments for Randall. Randall said Nassar already made the appointments. She told Randall that Nassar doesn’t make the appointments, she does. Nassar then came out with the information sheet.

Randall stated that she was “scared” and “uncomfortable” while Nassar was touching her in the places other than her back. She thought it was “weird”, and it “freaked her out.”
She didn’t know if it was possible that this type of touching was normal in this type of doctor visit, so when she got back to school she talked to a friend about it. The friend thought it was “weird.” Randall then called her mother and told her about it. Randall and her mother then came to MTPD on 09/17/04 and made this report.

Hospital examination
Randall and her mother both said that they would be agreeable to having Randall examined at the hospital. Randall and her mother went to Sparrow Hospital, and I met them there. At Sparrow Randall, her mother, and I all met with . is a Registered Nurse, and the coordinator of the Sexual Assault Program at Sparrow. spoke with the three of us for a short time. then wanted to speak to Randall, and subsequently examine her. At that time I left. stated she would call me when the exam was done, and would turn all evidence over to me.

Evidence
called at approximately 1:15am on 09/18/04, stating she had a completed examination kit to turn over to MTPD. Ofc Tobias went to Sparrow to get the kit from . He will do a supplemental report on picking the kit up.

Disposition
Forward to the investigations unit for further follow up.

Status
Open.

Submitted by:  

3
I was assigned to investigate this case by Sgt. Spencer. After reviewing the report, I contacted the victim, Brianne Randall, via telephone, and requested that she come to the Meridian Township Police Department for an interview. Ms. Randall agreed to do so and was interviewed on 9-21-04.

INTERVIEW WITH VICTIM, BRIANNE RANDALL:
Brianne Randall informed me that she has a medical condition known as scoliosis. Recently, Randall had started seeing a new doctor for her condition, Dr. Lawrence Nassar. The first time she saw Dr. Nassar was in August, she believes. At the August appointment, Dr. Nassar performed a brief examination and subsequently scheduled an appointment for physical therapy. During the initial exam, a student was following Dr. Nassar for the day, and Randall's mother was present as well. At that time, he had Randall put on a robe and some shorts that were fastened with Velcro on the sides. He did not give her any type of message, but asked her for a hug at the end of the appointment, which she found to be odd.

Randall's second appointment with Dr. Nassar was on 9-16-04, at approximately 0810 hrs. Nobody else was present at the time of the examination and he once again asked Ms. Randall to don a robe and Velcro shorts. Randall indicated to me that she was wearing underwear beneath the shorts, however, she was not wearing a bra. During the exam, Dr. Nassar told Randall that "I'm gonna do something that's going to give you a wedgie". He then pulled down the right side of her shorts and underwear, and proceeded to message her buttocks with his elbow. She indicated that this hurt, however, she did not say anything to him. The doctor then told her "I bet people at physical therapy don't do this". Dr. Nassar asked Randall if her back was bothering her and she indicated to him that she had some stiffness and soreness in her lower back, at which point he massaged that area as well. He then, once again, unfastened the side of her Velcro shorts, pulling down her underwear, and exposed her buttocks. With his left hand, Dr. Nassar was messaging her lower back, while his right cupped her vagina. Randall indicated that Dr. Nassar began pressing in different spots of her vaginal area, rather hard. Randall indicated that it seemed like he attempted to penetrate her vagina with his fingers, however, he was unable to do so because she had a tampon inserted at the time. After a while, Dr. Nassar moved to her upper back with his left hand, and with his right hand he squeezed her right breast and then continued rubbing it. Randall stated that he rubbed her breast...
for approximately five minutes. After finishing the message, Dr. Nassar asked Randall how she felt and took some notes on his clipboard. He noticed that her shorts were not yet refastened and asked her if she needed help with them. The doctor then went out to the reception area and scheduled two appointments for her. Randall found this to be unusual as the nurse typically performs these tasks.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:
I attempted to contact Dr. Nassar at his residence, via telephone, however, I was unable to do so. On 9-23-04 I left a message indicating that I wished to speak with him.

DISPOSITION:
Attach to original, on file MTPD.

STATUS:
Open pending further investigation.

Investigator Andrew McCready/Ip
On 9-24-04, I made contact with Dr. Lawrence Nassar in reference to scheduling an interview. Dr. Nassar agreed to come in and speak with me.

On 9-29-04, Dr. Nassar came to the Meridian Township Police Department and spoke with me reference this matter. Detective Bart Crane and I conducted the interview in the Investigations Unit interview room.

INTERVIEW WITH DR. LAWRENCE NASSAR:
Dr. Nassar advised me the he had indeed touched Brianne Randall in the perineum, applying pressure with his fingers as he did so. He further indicated that this procedure is a medical technique known as the Sacrotuberous Ligament Release. Dr. Nassar explained that the sacrotuberous ligament goes through the pelvic region, and in order to relieve lower back pain as well as upper leg pain, which the complainant, Brianne Randall was experiencing due to her scoliosis; he was required to touch said region. He indicated that the hamstring is affected, as well as the lower back, when this area is palpated. Dr. Nassar went on to say that this technique has been published in medical journals and training tapes instructing the same are available to physicians throughout the United States. He agreed to provide me with a Power Point presentation, in which the medical procedure is explained in detail. See attached Power Point presentation.

I then contacted the victim's mother, [DELETION].

INTERVIEW WITH [DELETION]:
I advised Mrs. [DELETION] of the explanation provided to me by Dr. Nassar for his actions on the date of the reported incident. Mrs. [DELETION] expressed concern, not necessarily in the medical procedure, but in the way that the doctor explained the procedure to her daughter. She was also troubled by the fact that Dr. Nassar did not wear latex gloves while performing said procedure. I explained to Mrs. [DELETION] that I would not be able to affect whether or not the doctor wore gloves or if he had another person present during the procedure, however, I would pass her concerns along to Dr. Nassar. I informed Mrs. [DELETION] that we would be closing the case with no prosecution being sought, due to the facts presented to me by Dr. Nassar.
04-18086
10-01-04
Det. McCready

DISPOSITION:
Attach to original, on file MTPD.

STATUS:
Closed.

Investigator Andrew McCready/Lp
The Sacrotuberosus Ligament
“The Grand Junction”

Larry Nassar, D.O., A.T.C.
Assistant Professor,
Michigan State University,
College of Osteopathic Medicine,
Department of Radiology,
Division of Sports Medicine
Course of the ST Ligament

- The Sacrotuberous Ligament is derived from the posteroinferior aspect of the Sacro-Iliac Joint Capsule.

- The ST Ligament lies between the:
  - Posterior iliac spines
  - Sacroiliac joint capsule
  - Coccyx
  - Ischial tuberosity
  - *Pubic symphysis (falciform ligament/process)
4 Fibrous Bands of the ST Ligament

- **Lateral Band** - PIIS to the Ischial Tuberosity
- **Medial Band** - Coccyx to the Ischial Tuberosity
- **Superior Band** - PSIS and PIIS to the Coccyx

**Central Bands** - Several bands arise from the lateral band and attach to the lower transverse tubercle of the lateral sacral crest at the same location as the inferior border of the long dorsal SI ligament (Falciform process)

Dorsal View of ST Ligament

- Lateral Band spans the piriformis to reach the ilium inferior to the PIIS and as it ascends to the PSIS it blends with the raphe.
- The multifidus distal attachment passes between the superior band and the long dorsal SI ligament to insert into the body of the ST Ligament.

Attachments to the ST Ligament

- Biceps Femoris
- Multifidus
- Interosseous ligament of the SI joint capsule
- Piriformis
- Gluteus Maximus


More Hip Lateral Rotators

"...the Inferior Gemellus originated from the lateral surface of the ischial tuberosity and also from the medial surface (intrapelvic origin) just beneath the obturator internus and is covered by the falciform process of the sacrotuberous ligament."

ST Ligament and the Hamstring

Frequently, the long head of the biceps femoris attaches to the sacrotuberous ligament allowing the force of the biceps femoris to be transferred to the sacrotuberous ligament. It has been shown that a distally directed tension applied to the biceps femoris was transferred to the ST Ligament even if there was no direct anatomical connection. Thus, in 100% of the cases the BF affected the ST Ligament.

Van Wingerden et al. 1993 A functional anatomical approach to the spine pelvis mechanism: interaction between the biceps femoris muscle and the sacrotuberous ligament. European Spine Journal 2:140-144
The biceps femoris is directly connected to the ribs/upper trunk via the sacrotuberous ligament, the erector spinae aponeurosis, and the iliocostalis thoracis.

Traction to the Bicep Femoris results in displacement of the deep lamina of the posterior layer of the thoracolumbar fascia, up to the level of L5S1 via the ST Ligament.

The deep lamina is fused with the superficial lamina at the level of the sacrum. Since the fibers of the deep lamina are continuous with the ST Ligament, an indirect link exists between the ST Ligament and the superficial lamina of the posterior layer of the thoracolumbar fascia.

ST Ligament and the Gait Cycle

R-Leg Swing Phase ➔ R-innominate rotates posteriorly relative to the sacrum (unilateral R-sacral nutation/flexion) ➔ ↑ R-ST Lig tension to prepare for heel strike to ↑ SI Jt stability ➔ Ctx of HS just before Heel Strike ➔ ↑ R-ST Lig tension to ↑ ↑ ST Lig tension to stabilize the SI Jt for heel strike

Dysfunction of the SI joint/ST Ligament creates a neurological inhibition of the gluteus maximus ➔ The hip can not extend as well due to the weak glut ➔ The gait stride is shorten ➔ The bicep femoris compensates and tries to extend the hip more creating a biomechanical inefficient SI closure at heel strike ➔ This may create SI Jt instability and overuse injury/strain/shortening of the hamstring (positive feed back cycle and recurrent HS Strains and SI Jt dysfunction)
ST Ligament and the Dysfunctional Gait Cycle

In general “tight” hamstrings are considered to be a pathologic side effect of LBP – HOWEVER – “tight” HS with SI jt instability is actually a beneficial compensatory mechanism.  **DO NOT over stretch the HS!**  Treat the cause of the SI jt instability → Glut Max no longer inhibited and it extends hip again → HS no longer is forced to compensate.  → Now you can restore normal function.

The biceps femoris distal attachment is to the fibula. Weinert et al demonstrated that the fibula moves inferior during heel strike. This downward movement of the fibula increases the tension on the biceps femoris AND THE SACROTUBEROUS LIGAMENT.

Therefore dysfunction of the fibula may effect the sacrotuberosus ligament - AND - dysfunction of the sacrotuberosus ligament may effect the fibula.

Innervation of the ST Ligament

- The ST Ligament is innervated by S2-4.
- There are no nerve branches from the ventral nerve roots to the SI joint/ligaments.
- The SI Joint and its ligaments are innervated exclusively from the dorsal branches of the sacral spinal nerves.
- All the dorsal nerve trunks pass between the layers of the ST Lig, pierce the origin of the Glut Max, and reach the skin as the nervi clunium medii.

Sacrotuberous Ligament Pain Pattern

Fig. 40.1 Pain pattern from the sacrotuberous ligament.

ST Ligament Assessment

- Sacrotuberous ligament will be tight on the left side with:
  - Posterior left innominate
  - Anterior sacral base (nutation), R & L tight
  - L/L sacral torsion

- ST Lig will be relaxed on the left side with:
  - Sup. L innominate
  - L unilateral sacral shear
  - Anterior left innominate
  - Sacral base posterior (counter nutation) both R&L relaxed
  - R/L sacral torsion
ST Ligament Release Prone with SI Joint Monitoring
Slump Test for Fascial Restrictions
Understanding the biomechanics of a single ligament can make a big difference.
**LABORATORY CASE RECEIPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory Number:</th>
<th>2355-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Number:</td>
<td>0404670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received By:</td>
<td>Locker number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Received:** 09-21-2004  
**Time Received:** 10:29 AM  
**Assigned To:** Julie A. Howenstine

**Delivered By:** ANDY MCENTEE  
**Agency:** Meridian Twp. P. D.  
**Address:** 5151 Marsh Road  
**City:** Okemos, MI 48864  
**Phone:** (517)347-5060

**Comments:** 1 SEALED BRN BAG W/CSC KIT  
**Type of Exam:** BIO/DNA

**Nature of Offense:** Sexual Assault CSC 1st

**Victim:** RANDALL, BRIANNE PATRICIA

**Suspect:** NASSAR, LAWRENCE GERARD

**Agency Number:** 04-18086  
**File Class:** 1100-5

---

* Please provide us with the Laboratory Number and Record Number when making inquiries or scheduling court pertaining to this case.

* Due to limited storage space please pick up your evidence promptly after you have received the Laboratory Report.

---

Please note: **Custody** filling is not visible in the image.
LABORATORY WORKSHEET

Laboratory Number: 2355-04
Record Number: 0404670
Received By: Locker number.

Delivered By: ANDY MCENTEE
Agency: Meridian Twp. P. D. 1-926
5151 Marsh Road
Okemos, MI 48864
(517) 347-5060

Date Received: 09/21/04
Time Received: 10:29 AM
Assigned To: Julie A. Howenstine

Comments: RETURNING 1 BROWN BAG....ITEM 1....WT
Nature of Offense: Sexual Assault CSC 1st
Victim: RANDALL, BRIANNE PATRICIA
Suspect: NASSAR, LAWRENCE GERARD

Agency Number: 04-18086
File Class: 1100-5
Type of Exam:
Examinations:
ID's:
Hours:

ITEMS RECEIVED BY:
NAME
AGENCY
DATE
TIME
RELEASED BY

 Custody
____/
____/
____/
____/
____/
Department Case Report

Department Case Number: 04-18086

Related Case # 's:

Case Information

Case Officer: Officer: 543 Paul Rambo
Offense Date/Time: 09/16/2004 - 08:10Hrs
Offense Location: 2900 Hannah Blvd #104
Offense Type: 1175 CSC 1ST/PENET OBJECT
Expiration Date: 09/16/2005
Jurisdiction: MTPD - Meridian Township Police Dept. 3392600

Court Date: 
Disposition: 
Disposition Date: 
Case Comments: 

Case Names

Name Type: S - Suspect
Business Name: 2900 Hannah Blvd #104
Contact Name: Nassar, Lawrence, Gerard
Address: 
Name Type: V - Victim
Name: Randall, Brianne, Patricia
Address: 
Name Type: W - Witness
Business Name: Sparrow Hospital
Contact Name: 
Address: 1215 E. Michigan Ave., PO Box 30480
Lansing, MI 48909-7980

Case Items

Item Number: 001
There is no owner associated with this item
Collection Date: 9/16/04 - 08:10
Collected By: 543 - Paul Rambo
Collection Location: Sparrow E.R.
Packaging/Quantity/Item Type: One sealed sexual assault kit box contai - Qty: 1 - Sexual assault kit
Detail Description: CSC
Make/Model: 
Status: 0002 - Stored In Location: Temporary Locker T1
Item Comments: 

Value: $0.00
Process: HOLD - Hold for investigative purposes
Department Case Report

Department Case Number: 04-18086

Related Case # 's:

Case Items

Item Number: 002
There is no owner associated with this item
Collection Date: 9/16/04 - 08:10 Collected By: 541 - Paul Rambo
Collection Location: sparrow hospital
Packaging/Quantity/Item Type: One sealed Manila envelope containing - Qty: 1 - Other item(s)
Detail Description: case kit info packet from examining nurse
Make/Model:
Status: 0002 - Stored In Location: Temporary Locker T1
Item Comments:
Collection Purpose: EVID - Investigative Evidence
Value: $0.00
Process: HOLD - Hold for investigative purposes

Item Number: 003
There is no owner associated with this item
Collection Date: 9/17/04 - 09:15 Collected By: 646 - Chrissy Scaccia
Collection Location: tot mtpd
Packaging/Quantity/Item Type: One sealed brown paper bag containing - Qty: 2 - Clothing
Detail Description: black bra w/ lace unknown size and white pair of womens panties
Make/Model:
Status: 0002 - Stored In Location: Temporary Locker T1
Item Comments:
Collection Purpose: EVID - Investigative Evidence
Value: $0.00
Process: HOLD - Hold for investigative purposes

Case Officer Signature:
9-17-04

Date
Supervisor Signature
Department Case Report
Department Case Number: 04-18086

Related Case #'s:

Case Items

Item Number: 002
There is no owner associated with this item
Collection Date: 9/16/04 - 08:10 Collected By: 543 - Paul Rambo
Collection Location: sparrow hospital
Packaging/Quantity/Item Type: One sealed manila envelope containing - Qty: 1 - Other item(s)
Detail Description: csc kit info packet from examining nurse
Make/Model:
Status: 0002 - Stored In Location: Temporary Locker T1
Item Comments: Collection Purpose: EVID - Investigative Evidence
Value: $0.00
Process: HOLD - Hold for investigative purposes

Case Officer Signature

Date

9/17/2004

Supervisor Signature
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE  
FORENSIC SCIENCE DIVISION  
LANSING LABORATORY  
7320 N. CANAL ROAD.  
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913  
(517)322-6690  
FAX (517)322-5598

LABORATORY REPORT

Laboratory No.: 2355-04  
Record No.: 0404670  
Received By: Locker number 1  
Date Received: 09-21-04  
Delivered By: ANDY MCENTEE  
Time Received: 10:29 AM  
File Class: 1100-5  
Agency No.: 04-18086  
Date Completed: 12-29-04

Nature of Offense:  
Sexual Assault CSC 1st

Victim(s):  
BRIANNE PATRICIA RANDALL

Suspect(s):  
LAWRENCE GERARD NASSAR

Evidence Received: (Removed from Locker #1 and placed in the Property Room by F/S Marie Bard-Curtis on 9-21-04 at 4:35 PM. Removed from the Property Room and placed in the Biology Refrigerator by F/T Heather Johnson on 9-30-04 at 3:15 PM. Removed from the Biology Refrigerator by the undersigned on 12-17-04.)

One sealed CSC kit (item #4670.04) holding the following items identified as coming from Brianne Patricia Randall:

A-buccal swabs (unopened, no exams)  
B-labia swabs  
C-labia majora smears  
D-anal swabs  
E-anal smears  
F-swabs from above the clitoris  
G-right breast swab (unopened, no exams)  
H-miscellaneous sample identified as a genital wipe

Results:

Chemical tests and microscopic examinations did not indicate the presence of seminal fluid or sperm cells on any of the swabs or smears submitted.

Chemical testing did not indicate the presence of seminal fluid on the clitoral swabs (item #4670.04F) and genital wipe (item #4670.04H) submitted.

(continued)  
The relevant supporting data upon which the expert opinion or inference was made are available for review/inspection.
Narrative

INFORMATION:

It was requested to pick up a C.S.C. Evidence Kit from Scenario.

Chain of Custody:

I took custody of the Kit and located it into MPU Evidence.

Report Disposition:

Report on file with MPU.

Status:

Closed
INFORMATION

When Ose Tobias picked up the CSC kit at Sparrow from this complaint, he also picked up the medical forms filled out by examining nurse [redacted]. Tobias turned the completed forms packet over to me at MTPD.

At MTPD, I copied the forms and tagged the original packet of forms into evidence at MTPD.

DISPOSITION

Attach to original report.

STATUS

OPEN - LOT 02

Submit by: Rambo 543

Follow-up assigned to: White: Records

Yellow: Investigations

Pink: Patrol

Report copy to: [] ICPD [] Twp Aliny [] FIA [] Other

Date due

Reviewed by
Additional Info:
I was advised by Andy McIntee that the victim's mother turned in some property to the cadet. The cadet Elias handed me a paper bag. In the paper bag was a black bra and a white pair of women's underwear.

I tagged these items into evidence.

Dep: on file with PD
Attachment to original

Status: open

Submit by: Signature: Follow-up assigned to: by: Date due: Reviewed by:
Disposition of evidence:

The Biology Unit is no longer retaining known or evidentiary samples in long term frozen storage. All items of evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Julie A. Howenstine, DVM
Forensic Scientist
Biology Subunit

The relevant supporting data upon which the expert opinion or inference was made are available for review/inspection.
Call Date: 09/16/2004  Time: 20:11:5  Dispatched: 20:18:2  CFS Code: INVE

Address: 2900 HANNAH BLVD 104

Location:

09/16/2004 20:11:52
WALK IN AT DESK, LATE, REFUSES MEDIC

09/16/2004 20:16:59
394-1000

09/16/2004 20:19:13
9A82-394-1000 NOT INVOLVED IN THIS CALL, NUMBER RE MSU

09/16/2004 20:19:13
CALL

09/16/2004 20:33:15
**UNIT> 9A82 ENROUTE TO MTPD FRONT DESK

09/16/2004 20:33:22
**UNIT> 9A82 ARRIVED AT MTPD FRONT DESK

09/16/2004 21:51:55
**UNIT> 9A82 ENROUTE TO SPARROW ER

09/16/2004 21:51:55
9A82-MEETING VICTIM AT SPARROW FOR CSC KIT

09/16/2004 21:53:25
**UNIT> 9A82 ARRIVED AT SPARROW ER

09/16/2004 21:53:34
**UNIT> 9A82 ENROUTE TO SPARROW

09/16/2004 22:06:02
**UNIT> 9A82 ARRIVED AT SPARROW

09/16/2004 23:23:08
**UNIT> 9A82 ENROUTE TO MTPD

09/16/2004 23:23:11
**UNIT> 9A82 ARRIVED AT MTPD

09/17/2004 01:18:59
**UNIT> 9A72 ENROUTE TO SPARROW

09/17/2004 01:20:04
**PREEMPTED FROM UNIT> 9A72

09/17/2004 01:20:55
**UNIT> 9A62 ENROUTE TO SPARROW

09/17/2004 01:20:55
9A62-PICKING UP KIT

09/17/2004 02:09:36
Call Date: 09/16/2004
Time: 20:11:5
Dispatched: 20:18:2
CFS Code: INVE

Address: 2900 HANNAH BLVD 104
Location:

**UNIT> 9A62 ARRIVED AT SPARROW**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAD Incident</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Additional Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case No</td>
<td>04018088</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>MERIDIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>0073</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street No</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>HANNAH</td>
<td>Street Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersect Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersect Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>INVEST, NO CRIM OFFENSE (9811)</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original CFS</td>
<td>CSC 1ST-PENETRATE OBJECT (1175)</td>
<td>Premise Type</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>09/16/2004</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>20:11:52</td>
<td>Call Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack Time</td>
<td>20:12:41</td>
<td>Dispatched</td>
<td>20:18:26</td>
<td>Dispatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>9A62</td>
<td>Arrived</td>
<td>20:28:50</td>
<td>Complete Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Disp</td>
<td>CLOSED (CLO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management Assign</td>
<td>Case Management Activity</td>
<td>Case Management Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No: 04010060</td>
<td>Sequence: 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Date: 9/17/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Review Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Report Date: 09/17/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction? [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No</td>
<td>Report No</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04018086</td>
<td>04000325</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DetAssign Date</th>
<th>Detective</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2004</td>
<td>McCready, Andrew (672)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleared Date</th>
<th>Detective Supervisor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2004</td>
<td>Spencer, Alan (506)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Review Date</th>
<th>Next Report Date</th>
<th>Highest UCR Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>INVESTIGATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No</td>
<td>04018086</td>
<td>Record Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Date</td>
<td>09/17/2004</td>
<td>Begin Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>10/04/2004</td>
<td>End Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>MCCREADY, ANDREW (672)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Type</td>
<td>PRIME INVESTIGATOR</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE ASSIGNED VICTIM AND OFFICER NOTIFIED
THE DOCTOR WAS USING A MEDICALLY ACCEPTED TECHNIQUE FOR
THE ALLEVIATION OF PAIN. NO CRIME WAS COMMITTED.
QUESTION #2

WHERE AND WHEN DID DETECTIVE MCCREADY INTERVIEW LARRY NASSAR?
IS THERE ANY AUDIO OR OTHER RECORDS RELATED TO THIS MEETING?

According to Detective McCready's supplemental report authored on September 24, 2004, he made phone contact with Larry Nassar for the purpose of scheduling an interview. As a result, the interview was subsequently set for September 29, 2004, for an unspecified time at the Meridian Township Police Department, located at 5151 Marsh Rd. Okemos, MI 48864.

Detective McCready’s report indicates both he and Detective Crane conducted the interview of Larry Nassar in the Investigations Unit Interview Room located within the Meridian Township Police Department. The location of this interview was further confirmed on February 6, 2019, during an interview this investigator had with Detective McCready.

The police report does not indicate, definitively, if the Nassar interview was recorded or not. During this investigator’s interview with Detective McCready on February 6, 2019, McCready stated that only a written documentation was made during the interview with Larry Nassar, and no recording of any type had taken place.

Detective Crane, in his interview on February 6, 2019, acknowledged sitting in on the interview with Detective McCready and Larry Nassar. He does not recall if he participated in the interview by asking any questions. Detective Crane has no independent knowledge or recollection if he prepared a report documenting the interview and his involvement. He was unable to locate a supplemental report written by him in the report provided to him for his review.
QUESTION # 3

WHY DID DETECTIVE MCCREADY NOT CONSULT ANOTHER MEDICAL EXPERT OR PERFORM ANY INVESTIGATION ON LARRY NASSAR’S EXPLANATION OF HIS “PROCEDURE”?

On February 6, 2019, Detective Andrew Mccready (now promoted to Sergeant) was interviewed at the Meridian Township Administrative Conference Room. As part of that interview, issues and questions were directed to Mccready in efforts to gain an understanding of why he never consulted with any medical expert(s) or conducted an investigation on Larry Nassar prior to closing his investigation.

Mccready’s report states that he, along with Detective Crane, interviewed Larry Nassar on September 29, 2004. It was as a result of that interview, Mccready stated he did not pursue further explanation of the procedure because he “believed his(Nassar) lies.” Specifically, Mccready believed that Nassar was performing a legitimate medical procedure.” Mccready indicated Meridian Township did not have the money to consult a doctor. He states, “You just can’t walk into a doctor’s office and ask them questions about something like this.” He said it was not up to the police department to obtain expert witnesses, and it was up to the prosecutor’s office to do so if deemed necessary for court.

After the interview with Larry Nassar, Mccready states he was leaning toward closing the complaint. Mccready stated, “Nassar had explained the procedure as being legitimate, therefore, not a crime.” Mccready indicates he did not reach out to his supervisor or anyone else in the department to discuss other possible options on how to proceed.
QUESTION #4

IS THERE ANY RECORD OF A MEETING WITH DETECTIVE MCCREADY, MY PARENTS AND LARRY NASSAR?

In reviewing the police report, there are no references to the meeting referred to in this question. The only reference to any conversation with anyone outside of any interviews is one made by McCready with the victim’s mother. The report does not indicate how the contact was made, whether by phone or in person, nor does the report make any reference to the date or time of the contact.

McCready’s supplemental report has a heading, INTERVIEW WITH ELLEN SPECKMAN-RANDALL. This paragraph includes McCready advising the victim’s mother of the explanation provided by Larry Nassar. In addition, the narrative describes other concerns and issues the victim’s mother had at that time. This investigator would not characterize the conversation described in the report as being a meeting between McCready, parents and Larry Nassar.

During this investigator’s interview with Chief Dave Hall (Ret.), Hall was asked if he recalled ever participating in or having knowledge of a meeting that took place between Nassar, MTPD and Randall’s family. He stated he had never been informed of any such meeting taking place. The same question was asked of current Chief Ken Plaga. Plaga indicated he had not been made aware of any such meeting, either. Due to the fact that McCready’s immediate supervisor declined to be interviewed, it is unknown if he has any knowledge of this meeting or not.

On March 8, 2019, this investigator reached out to the victim’s mother, Ellen Speckman-Randall by phone, at which time an approximately 50 minute interview took place. This investigator asked if she recalled ever attending a meeting with police, her husband, and Larry Nassar. She immediately and without hesitation replied, “Yes.” Speckman-Randall stated she recalled that the meeting was at the Michigan Athletic Club, commonly referred to as the MAC. She was 100% sure the meeting took place, and she was about 80% sure the meeting was at an office at the MAC. According to Speckman-Randall, the meeting did not take place in an exam room or lobby, but in a personal office, possibly Nassar’s.

Speckman-Randall is sure her husband, Tony, was not in attendance because he had been seriously ill with cancer, and as a result, was unable to attend. She is positive a police officer was present, but she could not be absolutely sure of who it was. After our interview, she believes it may have been McCready. She mentioned the officer may have been in uniform, as well, but she is not sure. This investigator learned in a previous interview with Randall, that she did not attend the meeting as “I didn’t want to face Nassar again.”

Speckman-Randall recalls the meeting was focused not on the procedure or its validity, but the way Larry Nassar conducted himself while doing the procedure. She acknowledged the fact that Nassar provided the investigation with a PowerPoint presentation and that McCready had believed it to be valid. Speckman-Randall accepted this validation from McCready’s explanation. She stated that she had not wanted to, “argue” with Nassar regarding the validity of the procedure because she was not a doctor, and he was a “mighty Olympic Doctor.” She still had concerns with the way he performed the procedure. She challenged Nassar’s nonuse of latex gloves, the way he explained what he was going to
do to her daughter, and the fact that he did not have another person in the room while doing the procedure. She recalls talking to McCreedy about the fact that she wanted to meet with Nassar to discuss those issues with him and not about the actual validity of the medical procedure he had performed on her daughter.

Speckman-Randall indicated her goal in the meeting with Nassar was to voice her concerns in hopes he would change his protocol/process to ensure this never happened to another girl again. During the meeting, she said Nassar was concerned about her complaint and acknowledged he would change how he conducted this procedure or treatment. Nassar acknowledged that her complaint “had merit.” Speckman-Randall left the meeting feeling good about what she had done and the way Nassar responded, saying he would change his procedure.

During the meeting, Nassar explained to Speckman-Randall that he knew from treating Randall that she was not as comfortable with her body as the upper level athletes he commonly treated. He told her the Olympic level athletes were more understanding of the treatments and, as a result, were much more comfortable with what was going on. She got the feeling during the conversation that Nassar knew he had been “put on the radar screen.” Speckman-Randall mentioned she believed Nassar had a “good rapport with people and he was very believable.” She also knew of Nassar’s status within the athletic and Olympic communities, and because of that she was somewhat reluctant to contest the treatment. This investigator got the distinct impression that because of Nassar’s status and what she had heard, Speckman-Randall was impressed with Nassar.

McCreedy stated in his interview on February 6, 2019, he was about 99.9% sure there was no meeting between the victim’s mother, father, Nassar and himself. He said even if there was a meeting, he would not have felt it necessary to have included it in the report anyway.

Both Randall and Speckman-Randall are adamant that the meeting occurred. Speckman-Randall even went into the focus and goals she had going into the meeting and recalled some of the specific comments made by Nassar. In addition, she was positive the meeting took place in “Nassar’s office,” and about 80% sure that the meeting took place at the MAC.

The vagueness of McCreedy’s explanation as to whether the meeting took place or not, and the fact that if it had happened it may not have been included in a police report, would make one question if the meeting took place or not.

As a result of the investigation into the question if there was ever a meeting between the family, police and Nassar, this investigator believes there was a meeting. This opinion is reached primarily because of McCreedy’s comments made during his interview. He stated, “You know not everything is put in a police report.” In addition, McCreedy stated in his interview, that he may have done things in the investigation, yet would not have put it in the report. When questioned on this matter, he became defensive, stating the meeting would not have reached the level of importance to have included it in the report.
QUESTION # 5

WHY WAS THE MEETING BETWEEN DETECTIVE MCCREADY, MY PARENTS AND LARRY NASSAR NOT DOCUMENTED IN THE POLICE REPORT?

During McCready’s interview on February 6, 2019, he indicated that he was about 99.9% sure there was no meeting between the victim’s mother, father, Nassar and himself at the conclusion of the investigation. Even if there was, he is not sure it would be in the police report because “it didn’t need to be.”
QUESTION #6

WHY WAS MY CASE NOT FORWARDED TO THE PROSECUTOR’S OFFICE? WAS IT STANDARD PROCEDURE AT THIS TIME FOR CASES LIKE MINE NOT TO BE FORWARDED TO THE PROSECUTOR’S OFFICE?

McCready indicates in his interview on February 6, 2019, quite simply, the report was not forwarded to the prosecutor’s office “because I believed his lies.” McCready was referring to Nassar’s explanation and PowerPoint presentation as to the validity of the procedure. He states after Larry Nassar provided the 26 page PowerPoint presentation, he believed the procedure done by Larry Nassar was a legitimate medical procedure; therefore, it was not a crime. It was for that reason, he states, that the investigation was not forwarded to the prosecutor’s office for review.

During Chief Hall’s (Ret.) interview, Hall indicated it was common practice to send investigations to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review at that time, although no specific policy or procedure existed.

In addition, this investigator was provided with all statistics of CSC cases McCready was assigned and worked from January 31, 2004, when he transferred into the detective bureau, through July 21, 2006, when he was promoted to the rank of sergeant and transferred out of the detective bureau.

The statistics document (See attached) provides the complaint number, date of complaint, type or classification of CSC alleged, officers assigned, if the case went to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office, the status after being reviewed by the prosecutor’s office and any other information regarding status. NOTE: The column titled “Ofc/Investigator” refers to who worked the complaint. The first officer’s name designates the officer taking the original report, most likely a uniformed Patrol Officer. The second listed name refers to the detective assigned to investigate the case. In four cases only McCready’s name was listed. In those cases the original report was filed directly with the Detective Bureau, bypassing Uniform Patrol. This procedure, under certain circumstances, is an accepted way of taking and processing complaints when received.

During the approximate 2 ½ years McCready was an investigator in the Detective Bureau, he was assigned 15 CSC investigations. One of the investigations reported to Meridian Township was later determined not to have occurred in the township. As a result, that report was turned over to the proper jurisdiction. The disposition and status of that case will not be included in the 14 investigations completed by McCready.

Of the 14 investigations, 13 were sent to either the prosecutor’s office or probate court for criminal warrants or juvenile petitions. Of those, seven criminal warrants or juvenile petitions were issued; four charges were denied; one case the victim’s mother declined to prosecute; one case the victim chose not to assist in the investigation; and, one case McCready closed the investigation on his own without sending it to the prosecutor’s office. The one case not forwarded to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office was the Randall investigation.
From the breakdown of the 14 investigations McCready was assigned, the evidence indicates he sent all but one on to the prosecutor’s office for review. Therefore, the evidence clearly indicates that as a matter of practice, McCready routinely sent CSC investigations on for prosecutorial review in efforts to seek criminal charges. In the Randall case, McCready did not send it on because he believed no crime had been committed.

In McCready’s interview on February 6, 2019, he acknowledged to this investigator he would not be in the interview and be involved in a Managers Review Investigation if he had only sent the investigation on to the prosecutor’s office. He also mentioned it was “not his best work.” This investigator asked McCready if he were confronted with the same circumstances, would he do anything different. He replied, “Yes.” This investigator asked what he would do differently, and he stated that he did not want to share what he would do differently.

During McCready’s interview, he states it is unknown if he ever contacted the prosecutor. He stated at one point, “Don’t know.” Nothing in the report suggests that he did.

Prior to interviewing McCready, this investigator learned of a triple homicide that occurred in Meridian Township, and the victims’ bodies were located on August 30, 2004. An arrest regarding that homicide was made on September 9, 2004. Randall’s complaint came in on September 17, 2004.

This investigator asked if there were any mitigating circumstances he wanted to share about the Randall investigation. Without any coaching or making any reference to the triple homicide prior to asking the question, McCready indicated they (Meridian Township) had a triple homicide at about the same time as Randall’s complaint came in. He recalled being very busy, indicating he was working about 40 cases at the time.

As part of this investigation, training records were requested through Township Manager Walsh. This investigator received those records and noted that on February 25 and 26, 2004, McCready attended a 16 hour Forensic Child Interview training. On September 14, 15 and 16, 2004, he attended a 21 hour Interview and Interrogation training. McCready’s report indicates he interviewed Randall on September 21, 2004, only days after returning from this school.

Up to the date of Randall’s report and investigation, training records for McCready do not show any CSC or basic detective trainings which he attended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Ofc/Investigator</th>
<th>ICPO</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-00864</td>
<td>1/14/2004</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Mankowski/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-07676</td>
<td>4/22/2004</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Sawallich/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-14777</td>
<td>7/29/2004</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Lofton/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-23758</td>
<td>12/13/2004</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hauserman/McCready</td>
<td>prob</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-04718</td>
<td>3/12/2004</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Hood/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>denied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-06906</td>
<td>4/11/2004</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Squires/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>denied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-18086</td>
<td>9/17/2004</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rambo/McCready</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>denied</td>
<td>investigator closed case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06812</td>
<td>4/13/2005</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Harris/McCready</td>
<td>prob</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-08871</td>
<td>5/15/2005</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Diebolt/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1st, 3rd, home invasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-23040</td>
<td>11/19/2005</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Kindy/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-15491</td>
<td>8/4/2005</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>denied</td>
<td>mother declined pros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-05825</td>
<td>3/29/2005</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>McCready</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>victim chose not to assist investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-12502</td>
<td>7/2/2005</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Rambo/McCready</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-11479</td>
<td>5/26/2006</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Harris/Royston/McCready</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>denied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-08766</td>
<td>4/24/2006</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>McCready</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>other juris; referred to DeWitt Twp PD Larry Horn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION #7

WHO OVERSAW DETECTIVE MCCREADY’S WORK?
IS THERE ANY DOCUMENTATION OF THIS?
IF THERE IS NO DOCUMENTATION OF THIS OVERSIGHT, WHY?

McCready’s immediate supervisor during the time of this investigation was Sgt. Alan Spencer. According to Meridian Township Human Resources Department records, Spencer was assigned as the Investigations Bureau Supervisor on January 7, 2002, approximately two years and nine months prior to the time of the Randall investigation. Those records also indicate McCready was assigned to investigations on January 31, 2004, approximately eight and one half months prior to the investigation.

This investigator requested and received three years of annual evaluations for McCready. Employee evaluations for years 2002, 2003 and 2004 were obtained and reviewed. The 2004 evaluation form was completed by Spencer and signed on February 2, 2005. Spencer only evaluated McCready during 2004. McCready had been assigned to investigations for 11 months at the time of the evaluation period which ended on December 31, 2004.

Spencer was contacted by phone regarding this investigation and requested to participate in an interview in efforts to ask questions and to clarify matters directly related to this investigation. Spencer respectfully declined to be interviewed.

As a result of Spencer’s refusal to participate in an interview, this investigator was unable to gain answers to several relevant questions that only he would know. Other efforts were used in attempts to gain information that Spencer was not able to provide directly.

The question regarding any documentation as to who McCready’s supervisor was, is clear. This investigator located four references of this documentation in the file:

- Det. McCready’s police report states he was assigned the investigation by Spencer.
- Case Management System shows Spencer assigned the investigation to McCready.
- Case Management System shows Spencer concurred with the closing of the investigation after submitted by McCready.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Start/End Dates</th>
<th>Current Position as of 9/16/04</th>
<th>Transfer Date Prior to 9/16/04</th>
<th>Promotion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rambo Police Officer</td>
<td>1/10/1995 – Currently employed</td>
<td>Road Patrol – Police Officer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 8

WHY WAS I DENIED A COPY OF MY POLICE REPORT WHEN I REQUESTED IT ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2016 AND WHY WAS IT CONTINUALLY DENIED UNTIL JANUARY 2018, LONG AFTER THE INVESTIGATION WAS CONCLUDED AND LARRY NASSAR HAD ENTERED A GUILTY PLEA?

Brianne’s original Freedom of Information Request or FOIA, was sent to Meridian Township Records Supervisor Cindy Cummings on September 13, 2016 at 11:37 am via e-mail. (See attached) Your request was for the 2004 report regarding a sexual assault case filed by you with the Meridian Township Police Department on September 17, 2004. You indicated in your e-mail the purpose for your request was twofold, the first to bring information to the attention of police who were investigating the matter and secondly to have a copy for your records. Meridian Township had 5 days to respond to your request by law. In addition, the township could invoke a 10 day extension by law as well.

On September 16, 2016, Cindy Cummings responded to your request by providing a Notice of Extension. (See attached) Further, Ms. Cummings indicated you would be provided a written notice on or before October 4, 2016. This would be to comply with the 10 day extension requirement.

On September 19, 2016 at 1:56 pm, Lisa McCormick, Chief Assistant Prosecutor for the Ingham County Prosecutors Office sent Chief David Hall an e-mail indicating in part, The case is part of an ongoing investigation into similar conduct by Lawrence Nassar. We are asking that you do not release this under FOIA because it would impede our ongoing criminal investigation..... I have also spoke with the victim in this case and explained the situation to her and she understands that the FOIA will be denied at this time. (See attached)

On September 21, 2016, Ms. Cummings responded to your original request via e-mail which was within the 10 business day requirement, and in doing so denied your request based on the direction of Lisa McCormick’s e-mail. Included in your denial was an explanation of your right to appeal the decision and how to proceed if you so desired.

On December 20, 2017 at 8:56 am, Christopher S. Patterson, legal counsel for Meridian Township authored an e-mail to Ms. Povilaitis Assistant Attorney General for the Michigan Department of Attorney General Criminal Division. (See attached) Mr. Patterson was requesting clarification on how the 2004 case could be treated as an investigation.
On December 20, 2017 at 9:32 am, Ms. Povilaitis responded to Mr. Pattersons e-mail (See attached) in essence outlining the reasons your police report could not be released until the sentences were completed. Your case was not charged but was one that is part of the plea agreement. Ms. Povilaitis states,.... I have advised others, including the Ingham County Prosecutor's office, that until all of the sentencings are completed on 1/31/18, those files are still technically open investigations and should be treated as such. We will not be releasing any records before that time.

Although this investigator agrees with your assessment the investigation had been closed for some time and Larry Nassar had already entered a guilty plea, he had not yet been sentenced, therefor for purposes of FOIA, the case was still open, and could not be released.

In Ms. Povilaitis response to Mr. Pattersons e-mail on December 20, 2017, states impart, “The plea agreements outline certain expectations of both parties when entering into the agreements. Should the court(s) decide not to follow the terms of the sentence agreement either party would be able to withdraw from the agreement. These types of pleas are called Killebrew pleas in Michigan state courts. All 125 reported victims are in support of the plea agreement terms.”

This investigator could not locate any communication or e-mail making any differentiation between releasing the report to you or the press, general public etc. The determination not to release the report until after sentencing was a blanket decision and not individualized or directed to you in any way.

The Meridian Township Police Records Department provided this investigator with a log of all the FOIA requests that had been filed. To date, a total of 23 Freedom of Information requests have been filed for the report. Also contained in the log information were the actual FOIA requests complete with appropriate responses in which all appear to be FOIA compliant. No reports had been released prior to the sentencing of Larry Nassar.
Ms. Randall,
I am in receipt of your request.

Ms. Cummings,

I am emailing you to request records from 2004 (I believe). It was on a sexual assault case and I was a minor at the time. There is currently a criminal case as well as a civil case against the man who assaulted me at that time. I would like to bring this information to the attention of the police who are investigating this and also have it for my records. I currently live in Seattle and am unable to come in to get it myself. I do not have a record number. My phone number is [REDACTED] and address is [REDACTED]. Thank you.

Bree Randall PA-C
NOTICE OF EXTENSION

Ms. Randall:

The Meridian Township Police Department has received your request for public records under the Michigan Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), MCL 15.231 et seq.

We are extending the time for responding to your request by ten (10) business days, as permitted under MCL 15.235, Section 5 (2)(d). Therefore, a written notice will be issued to you on or before October 4, 2016.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact my office at (517) 853-4816 or email me at cummings@meridian.mi.us. You may also write to me at the address listed below and enclose a copy of this correspondence.

Sincerely,

Cindy Cummings, Records Unit Supervisor
Meridian Township Police Department

5151 MARSH ROAD, OKEMOS, MICHIGAN 48864-1198 (517) 853-4000
www.meridian.mi.us
September 21, 2016

Brianne Randall

RE: FOIA Request/Incident #04-18086
F16-771

Ms. Randall:

This notice is issued in response to your request received September 13, 2016 asking for information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), MCL 15.231, et. seq.

The Meridian Township Police Department has denied your request. Pursuant to MCL 15.243(1)(b)(i)(ii), at this time the requested documents are exempt from disclosure because they constitute investigative records compiled for law enforcement purposes and the Ingham County Prosecuting Attorney, as chief law enforcement officer of the County, has determined that their release will interfere with law enforcement proceedings and deprive persons of the right to a fair trial.

Since your request has been denied, you have the right to: (1) submit to Frank Walsh, Township Manager, a written appeal that specifically states the word “appeal” and identifies the reason or reasons for the reversal of the disclosure denial, or; (2) seek judicial review of this decision in accordance with MCL 15.240. If, after judicial review, the court determines that the Township has not complied with statutory disclosure requirements and orders disclosure of all or a portion of the public record, you have the right to receive attorney fees and damages as provided in MCL 15.240.

If you have any further questions or concerns, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Cindy Cummings, Records Unit Supervisor
Meridian Township Police Department
cummings@meridian.mi.us
First of all, just a heads up regarding this case with Dr. Lawrence Nassar at MSU Sports Med...I am now up to 3 victims of CSC. I meant to call you earlier so you were aware we’re taking them because we lease the space in that building on Eyde Pkway.

Second, one of the victims that called the reporter said she filed a report with MTPD in 2003. Her name is Brianne Randall now but that may be her married name. Can you see if you have a report on Nassar from 2003?

Thanks!!
Chief Hall called me last this afternoon to let me know our township handled a 2004 complaint regarding Dr. Larry Nassar, the Michigan State University doctor currently under investigation for illegal sexual conduct. The Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office has been in touch with our department to FOIA the complaint.

I thought you should know of our potential involvement with the ongoing investigation of Dr. Nassar and the media coverage that may follow.

Frank

Frank L. Walsh
Township Manager
Charter Township of Meridian
P: (517) 853-4254
F: (517) 853-4251

www.meridian.mi.us
www.facebook.com/MeridianTownship
www.twitter.com/MeridianTwp
https://www.linkedin.com/in/frankwalsh3
https://managersperspective.wordpress.com/
Chief,
I also spoke with the victim and reporter who requested the report on Friday and mailed them an extension letter. I will keep in touch with Lisa when the extension period is near. I can deny in full if it would interfere with their investigation at that time. I know the victim and reporter understand and I do not expect them to appeal the decision.

Sent from mobile device.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "McCormick, Lisa" <LMccormick@ingham.org>
Date: September 19, 2016 at 13:56:56 EDT
To: "'hall@meridian.mi.us'" <hall@meridian.mi.us>
Subject: MTPD 2004 Investigation regarding Lawrence Nassar

Hi – This is to confirm our conversation from Friday that the above case is part of an ongoing investigation into similar conduct by Lawrence Nassar. We are asking that you do not release this under FOIA because it would impede our ongoing criminal investigation. If you have any questions please let me know. I have also spoke with the victim in this case and explained the situation to her and she understands that the FOIA will be denied at this time. Thanks Lisa

Lisa McCormick
Chief Assistant Prosecutor
303 W. Kalamazoo St 4R
Lansing MI 48933
517-483-6247 (direct line)
From: Christopher Patterson
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 8:56 AM
To: Povilaitis, Angela (AG) <PovilaitisA@michigan.gov>
Cc: Cindy Cummings <cummings@meridian.mi.us>; Stephen Delie
Subject: RE: Nassar FOIA (Meridian Twp)

Ms. Povilaitis,

We serve as legal counsel for Meridian Township. I work directly with Cindy Cummings on handling certain FOIA requests. As you may be aware, we are receiving additional FOIA requests for the 2004 case held by Meridian Twp now that Mr. Nassar has entered a plea. We intend to also deny the requests until after the January sentencing. For purposes of edification, however, I want to make sure I fully understand the mechanism by which the 2004 case could be treated as an investigation. I do not currently practice criminal law, but my previous experience at the federal courts suggests that the plea agreement has a general condition related to the potential min/max of the sentencing for the cases included. If that min/max is exceeded by the Court on January 31, 2018, is there a provision for Nassar to withdraw the plea or is he entitled to move for withdrawal under general criminal law?

We just want to ensure we fully understand the mechanism by which the 2004 case would be investigated and potentially part of an actual trial.

If you can let me know at your earliest convenience, I would appreciate it. If you would prefer to discuss by phone, please call me at 517.381.3205.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Chris

Christopher S. Patterson, Attorney
Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes PLC
4151 Okemos Road
Okemos, Michigan 48864
Direct (517) 381-3205
Tel (517) 381-0100
Fax (517) 381-5051
Website: www.fsbrlaw.com
Mr. Patterson,

As I advised Cindy Cummings in response to her questions in early December, the 2004 Meridian Twp. case was re-opened by MSU PD. It is my understanding the MSU PD then assumed the investigation after it was reopened in 2016. It was forwarded to our office for review (with all of the other cases) and is part of our current group of cases involved in the plea agreement and sentencing. This case was not one that was charged but is one that is part of the plea agreement. I have advised others, including the Ingham County Prosecutor's office, that until all of the sentencings are completed on 1/31/2018, those files are still technically open investigations and should be treated as such. We will not be releasing any records before that time.

The plea agreements outline certain expectations of both parties when entering into the agreements. Should the court(s) decide not to follow the terms of the sentence agreement, either party would be able to withdraw from the agreement. These types of pleas are called Killebrew pleas in Michigan state courts. All 125 reported victims are in support of the plea agreement terms.

Should you have any additional questions, please contact me directly at the number below.

Thank you.

Angela M. Povilaitis
Assistant Attorney General
Michigan Department of Attorney General
Criminal Division
3030 W. Grand Blvd, Ste. 10-200
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 456-0064
(313) 456-3454 (fax)
PovilaitisA@michigan.gov

Ms. Povilaitis,

We serve as legal counsel for Meridian Township. I work directly with Cindy Cummings on handling certain FOIA requests. As you may be aware, we are receiving additional FOIA requests for the 2004 case held by Meridian Twp now
Over the past year I hope that you believe I've attempted to keep you apprised of our 2004 Nassar investigation. I've shied away from providing too much information for fear of getting ahead of the much larger MSU case and I've never believed it is appropriate for elected officials to have a lot of detail when it comes to a criminal sexual assault investigation. I've not read the report and have no plans to avail myself to the personal, graphic nature of the incident.

Today I want to lay out what we have been doing, what we are going to do and how we are handling the issue.

It is clear that we should have sent the case to the IC Prosecutor's office. We failed in that regard. We will release the complete investigation to the public as soon as we are cleared to do so by the AG's office.

This is our plan to address our shortcomings in 2004, subject to approval from our legal counsel and insurance carrier.

We will prepare a public statement that clearly offers an apology and admits we mishandled the investigation by trusting Nassar's medical reasoning for the sexual assault. Sadly, we were convinced of Nassar's medical justification.

Two weeks ago Chief Hall and Assistant Chief Plaga instituted a 15 year review of all sexual assault complaints received by the MTPD.

We very likely will request that the Michigan State Police investigate the 2004 complaint to make sure that there was no impropriety between our investigator and Nassar.

Although we have an officer who holds specialized training in investigating sexual assaults, we plan to increase our sexual assault training amongst our sworn personnel. Officer Payne, who joined our department in 2007, is highly regarded for her work in the area of sexual assaults.

Chief Hall, the investigator and I will reach out to the victim and her parents and offer to meet with them. We very much hope the family accepts our invitation as to provide the township an opportunity to express our deep regret for how we handled the 2004 complaint. More importantly, we want to provide an opportunity for the family to share their most personal feelings for how we handled the 2004 complaint. We must do the right thing.

It is important to note that Sergeant McCready (the 2004 investigator) is very apologetic for not forwarding the complaint to Ingham County.

Please know the issue has my full attention and we are going to respond in an appropriate manner.

Frank
Chief,

Here is the email received from the Attorney General’s Office.

I have received 12 requests for the report, including a request from the victim, and all have been denied.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Cindy

---

Mr. Patterson,

As I advised Cindy Cummings in response to her questions in early December, the 2004 Meridian Twp. case was re-opened by MSU PD. It is my understanding the MSU PD then assumed the investigation after it was reopened in 2016. It was forwarded to our office for review (with all of the other cases) and is part of our current group of cases involved in the plea agreement and sentencing. This case was not one that was charged but is one that is part of the plea agreement. I have advised others, including the Ingham County Prosecutor’s office, that until all of the sentencings are completed on 1/31/2018, those files are still technically open investigations and should be treated as such. We will not be releasing any records before that time.

The plea agreements outline certain expectations of both parties when entering into the agreements. Should the court(s) decide not to follow the terms of the sentence agreement, either party would be able to withdraw from the agreement. These types of pleas are called Killebrew pleas in Michigan state courts. All 125 reported victims are in support of the plea agreement terms.

Should you have any additional questions, please contact me directly at the number below.

Thank you.

Angela M. Povilaitis
Assistant Attorney General
Michigan Department of Attorney General
Criminal Division
3030 W. Grand Blvd, Ste. 10-200
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 456-0064
(313) 456-3454 (fax)
If a charge reduction is required under subdivision (a), fully note the charge reduction on the detailed itemization described under subsection (4).

(10) This section does not apply to public records prepared under an act or statute specifically authorizing the sale of those public records to the public, or if the amount of the fee for providing a copy of the public record is otherwise specifically provided by an act or statute.

(11) Subject to subsection (12), after a public body has granted and fulfilled a written request from an individual under this act, if the public body has not been paid in full the total amount under subsection (1) for the copies of public records that the public body made available to the individual as a result of that written request, the public body may require a deposit of up to 100% of the estimated fee before it begins a full public record search for any subsequent written request from that individual if all of the following apply:

(a) The final fee for the prior written request was not more than 105% of the estimated fee.
(b) The public records made available contained the information being sought in the prior written request and are still in the public body's possession.
(c) The public records were made available to the individual, subject to payment, within the time frame estimate described under subsection (8).
(d) Ninety days have passed since the public body notified the individual in writing that the public records were available for pickup or mailing.
(e) The individual is unable to show proof of prior payment to the public body.
(f) The public body calculates a detailed itemization, as required under subsection (4), that is the basis for the current written request's increased estimated fee deposit.

(12) A public body shall no longer require an increased estimated fee deposit from an individual as described under subsection (11) if any of the following apply:

(a) The individual is able to show proof of prior payment in full to the public body.
(b) The public body is subsequently paid in full for the applicable prior written request.
(c) Three hundred sixty-five days have passed since the individual made the written request for which full payment was not remitted to the public body.

(13) A deposit required by a public body under this act is a fee.

(14) If a deposit that is required under subsection (8) or (11) is not received by the public body within 45 days from receipt by the requesting person of the notice that a deposit is required, and if the requesting person has not filed an appeal of the deposit amount pursuant to section 10a, the request shall be considered abandoned by the requesting person and the public body is no longer required to fulfill the request. Notice of a deposit requirement under subsection (8) or (11) is considered received 3 days after it is sent, regardless of the means of transmission. Notice of a deposit requirement under subsection (8) or (11) must include notice of the date by which the deposit must be received, which date is 48 days after the date the notice is sent.


Constitutionality: The disclosure of public records under the freedom of information act impartially to the general public for the incremental cost of creating the record is not a granting of credit by the state in aid of private persons and does not justify nondisclosure on the theory that the information is proprietary information belonging to a public body. Keszenbaum v Michigan State University, 414 Mich 510; 417 NW2d 1102 (1982).

Popular name: Act 442
Popular name: FOIA

15.235 Request to inspect or receive copy of public record; response to request; failure to respond; damages; contents of notice denying request; signing notice of denial; notice extending period of response; action by requesting person; law enforcement records management system.

Sec. 5. (1) Except as provided in section 3, a person desiring to inspect or receive a copy of a public record shall make a written request for the public record to the FOIA coordinator of a public body. A written request made by facsimile, electronic mail, or other electronic transmission is not received by a public body's FOIA coordinator until 1 business day after the electronic transmission is made. However, if a written request is sent by electronic mail and delivered to the public body's spam or junk-mail folder, the request is not received until 1 day after the public body first becomes aware of the written request. The public body shall note in its records both the time a written request is delivered to its spam or junk-mail folder and the time the public body first becomes aware of that request.

(2) Unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the person making the request, a public body shall respond to a request for a public record within 5 business days after the public body receives the request by doing 1 of the following:
(a) Granting the request.
(b) Issuing a written notice to the requesting person denying the request.
(c) Granting the request in part and issuing a written notice to the requesting person denying the request in part.
(d) Issuing a notice extending for not more than 10 business days the period during which the public body shall respond to the request. A public body shall not issue more than 1 notice of extension for a particular request.

(3) Failure to respond to a request pursuant to subsection (2) constitutes a public body's final determination to deny the request if either of the following applies:
   (a) The failure was willful and intentional.
   (b) The written request included language that conveyed a request for information within the first 250 words of the body of a letter, facsimile, electronic mail, or electronic mail attachment, or specifically included the words, characters, or abbreviations for "freedom of information", "information", "FOIA", "copy", or a recognizable misspelling of such, or appropriate legal code reference to this act, on the front of an envelope or in the subject line of an electronic mail, letter, or facsimile cover page.

(4) In a civil action to compel a public body's disclosure of a public record under section 10, the court shall assess damages against the public body pursuant to section 10(7) if the court has done both of the following:
   (a) Determined that the public body has not complied with subsection (2).
   (b) Ordered the public body to disclose or provide copies of all or a portion of the public record.

(5) A written notice denying a request for a public record in whole or in part is a public body's final determination to deny the request or portion of that request. The written notice must contain:
   (a) An explanation of the basis under this act or other statute for the determination that the public record, or portion of that public record, is exempt from disclosure, if that is the reason for denying all or a portion of the request.
   (b) A certificate that the public record does not exist under the name given by the requester or by another name reasonably known to the public body, if that is the reason for denying the request or a portion of the request.
   (c) A description of a public record or information on a public record that is separated or deleted pursuant to section 14, if a separation or deletion is made.
   (d) A full explanation of the requesting person's right to do either of the following:
      (i) Submit to the head of the public body a written appeal that specifically states the word "appeal" and identifies the reason or reasons for reversal of the disclosure denial.
      (ii) Seek judicial review of the denial under section 10.
   (e) Notice of the right to receive attorneys' fees and damages as provided in section 10 if, after judicial review, the court determines that the public body has not complied with this section and orders disclosure of all or a portion of a public record.

(6) The individual designated in section 6 as responsible for the denial of the request shall sign the written notice of denial.

(7) If a public body issues a notice extending the period for a response to the request, the notice must specify the reasons for the extension and the date by which the public body will do 1 of the following:
   (a) Grant the request.
   (b) Issue a written notice to the requesting person denying the request.
   (c) Grant the request in part and issue a written notice to the requesting person denying the request in part.

(8) If a public body makes a final determination to deny in whole or in part a request to inspect or receive a copy of a public record or portion of that public record, the requesting person may do either of the following:
   (a) Appeal the denial to the head of the public body pursuant to section 10.
   (b) Commence a civil action, pursuant to section 10.

(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act to the contrary, a public body that maintains a law enforcement records management system and stores public records for another public body that subscribes to the law enforcement records management system is not in possession of, retaining, or the custodian of, a public record stored on behalf of the subscribing public body. If the public body that maintains a law enforcement records management system receives a written request for a public record that is stored on behalf of a subscribing public body, the public body that maintains the law enforcement records management system shall, within 10 business days after receipt of the request, give written notice to the requesting person identifying the subscribing public body and stating that the requesting person shall submit the request to the subscribing public body. As used in this subsection, "law enforcement records management system" means a data storage system that may be used voluntarily by subscribers, including any subscribing public bodies, to share information and facilitate intergovernmental collaboration in the provision of law enforcement services.
15.243 Exemptions from disclosure; public body as school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy; withholding of information required by law or in possession of executive office.

Sec. 13. (1) A public body may exempt from disclosure as a public record under this act any of the following:

(a) Information of a personal nature if public disclosure of the information would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of an individual's privacy.

(b) Investigating records compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that disclosure as a public record would do any of the following:
   (i) Interfere with law enforcement proceedings.
   (ii) Deprive a person of the right to a fair trial or impartial administrative adjudication.
   (iii) Constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
   (iv) Disclose the identity of a confidential source, or if the record is compiled by a law enforcement agency in the course of a criminal investigation, disclose confidential information furnished only by a confidential source.
   (v) Disclose law enforcement investigative techniques or procedures.
   (vi) Endanger the life or physical safety of law enforcement personnel.

(c) A public record that if disclosed would prejudice a public body's ability to maintain the physical security of custodial or penal institutions occupied by persons arrested or convicted of a crime or admitted because of a mental disability, unless the public interest in disclosure under this act outweighs the public interest in nondisclosure.

(d) Records or information specifically described and exempted from disclosure by statute.

(e) A public record or information described in this section that is furnished by the public body originally compiling, preparing, or receiving the record or information to a public officer or public body in connection with the performance of the duties of that public officer or public body, if the considerations originally giving rise to the exempt nature of the public record remain applicable.

(f) Trade secrets or commercial or financial information voluntarily provided to an agency for use in developing governmental policy if:
   (i) The information is submitted upon a promise of confidentiality by the public body.
   (ii) The promise of confidentiality is authorized by the chief administrative officer of the public body or by an elected official at the time the promise is made.
   (iii) A description of the information is recorded by the public body within a reasonable time after it has been submitted, maintained in a central place within the public body, and made available to a person upon request. This subdivision does not apply to information submitted as required by law or as a condition of receiving a governmental contract, license, or other benefit.

(g) Information or records subject to the attorney-client privilege.

(h) Information or records subject to the physician-patient privilege, the psychologist-patient privilege, the minister, priest, or Christian Science practitioner privilege, or other privilege recognized by statute or court rule.

(i) A bid or proposal by a person to enter into a contract or agreement, until the time for the public opening of bids or proposals, or if a public opening is not to be conducted, until the deadline for submission of bids or proposals has expired.

(j) Appraisals of real property to be acquired by the public body until either of the following occurs:
   (i) An agreement is entered into.
   (ii) Three years have elapsed since the making of the appraisal, unless litigation relative to the acquisition has not yet terminated.

(k) Test questions and answers, scoring keys, and other examination instruments or data used to administer a license, public employment, or academic examination, unless the public interest in disclosure under this act outweighs the public interest in nondisclosure.

(l) Medical, counseling, or psychological facts or evaluations concerning an individual if the individual's identity would be revealed by a disclosure of those facts or evaluation, including protected health information, as defined in 45 CFR 160.103.

(m) Communications and notes within a public body or between public bodies of an advisory nature to the extent that they cover other than purely factual materials and are preliminary to a final agency determination of policy or action. This exemption does not apply unless the public body shows that in the particular instance the public interest in encouraging frank communication between officials and employees of public bodies...
the position. However, after 1 or more individuals have been identified as finalists for a position described in this subdivision, this subdivision does not apply to a public record described in this subdivision, except a letter of recommendation or reference, to the extent that the public record relates to an individual identified as a finalist for the position.

(y) Records or information of measures designed to protect the security or safety of persons or property, or the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of information systems, whether public or private, including, but not limited to, building, public works, and public water supply designs to the extent that those designs relate to the ongoing security measures of a public body, capabilities and plans for responding to a violation of the Michigan anti-terrorism act, chapter LXXXIII-A of the Michigan penal code, 1931 PA 328, MCL 750.543a to 750.543z, emergency response plans, risk planning documents, threat assessments, domestic preparedness strategies, and cybersecurity plans, assessments, or vulnerabilities, unless disclosure would not impair a public body's ability to protect the security or safety of persons or property or unless the public interest in disclosure outweighs the public interest in nondisclosure in the particular instance.

(z) Information that would identify or provide a means of identifying a person that may, as a result of disclosure of the information, become a victim of a cybersecurity incident or that would disclose a person's cybersecurity plans or cybersecurity-related practices, procedures, methods, results, organizational information system infrastructure, hardware, or software.

(aa) Research data on road and attendant infrastructure collected, measured, recorded, processed, or disseminated by a public agency or private entity, or information about software or hardware created or used by the private entity for such purposes.

(2) A public body shall exempt from disclosure information that, if released, would prevent the public body from complying with 20 USC 1232g, commonly referred to as the family educational rights and privacy act of 1974. A public body that is a local or intermediate school district or a public school academy shall exempt from disclosure directory information, as defined by 20 USC 1232g, commonly referred to as the family educational rights and privacy act of 1974, requested for the purpose of surveys, marketing, or solicitation, unless that public body determines that the use is consistent with the educational mission of the public body and beneficial to the affected students. A public body that is a local or intermediate school district or a public school academy may take steps to ensure that directory information disclosed under this subsection shall not be used, rented, or sold for the purpose of surveys, marketing, or solicitation. Before disclosing the directory information, a public body that is a local or intermediate school district or a public school academy may require the requester to execute an affidavit stating that directory information provided under this subsection shall not be used, rented, or sold for the purpose of surveys, marketing, or solicitation.

(3) This act does not authorize the withholding of information otherwise required by law to be made available to the public or to a party in a contested case under the administrative procedures act of 1969, 1969 PA 306, MCL 24.201 to 24.328.

(4) Except as otherwise exempt under subsection (1), this act does not authorize the withholding of a public record in the possession of the executive office of the governor or lieutenant governor, or an employee of either executive office, if the public record is transferred to the executive office of the governor or lieutenant governor, or an employee of either executive office, after a request for the public record has been received by a state officer, employee, agency, department, division, bureau, board, commission, council, authority, or other body in the executive branch of government that is subject to this act.


Compiler's note: For transfer of powers and duties of department of history, arts, and libraries or the Michigan historical center relating to the identification, certification, and preservation of historical sites to the Michigan state housing development authority, see E.R.O. No. 2009-26, compiled at MCL 399.752.

Popular name: Act 442
Popular name: FOIA

15.243a Salary records of employee or other official of institution of higher education, school district, intermediate school district, or community college available to public on request.

Sec. 13a. Notwithstanding section 13, an institution of higher education established under section 5, 6, or 7 of article 8 of the state constitution of 1963; a school district as defined in section 6 of Act No. 451 of the Public Acts of 1976, being section 380.6 of the Michigan Compiled Laws; an intermediate school district as defined in section 4 of Act No. 451 of the Public Acts of 1976, being section 380.4 of the Michigan Compiled Laws; or a community college established under Act No. 331 of the Public Acts of 1966, as amended, being
QUESTION # 9

IF AT ANY POINT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OR INGHAM COUNTY PROSECUTOR’S OFFICE INFORMED MERIDIAN NOT TO RELEASE MY RECORDS, WHEN WAS THIS DONE AND TO WHOM DID THEY SPECIFICALLY INSTRUCT THEM NOT TO RELEASE TO?

WAS THE RESTRICTION OF RELEASING THIS RECORD INTENDED FOR ME, THE PUBLIC OR BOTH?

This question is addressed in Question #8
QUESTION #10

WHAT WERE THE FINDINGS OF THE INTERNAL INVESTIGATION OF MY CASE?
WAS THERE A REPORT OF THIS INVESTIGATION?

Randall had been told there was an internal investigation by the police department that had been conducted regarding McCready’s handling of her case. During interviews with current Police Chief Plaga and retired Chief Hall, both indicated there was no internal investigation conducted by the police department. Township Manager Walsh stated in his interview that he initiated what he referred to as a Manager’s Review. He also confirmed there was no internal investigation by the police department.

Walsh indicated the reason for the Manager’s Review was to determine what if any, actions should be taken against McCready for his investigation of the Randall case, and his failure to send the report to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review. Walsh made it clear that the review was initiated by him, investigated by him and the decision was ultimately made by him, not to discipline McCready for his actions.

Typically, a police department internal investigation involves a complaint against an employee from either an internal or external source. An internal investigation complaint number is taken and allegations are investigated, with findings determined. The officer is notified up front of the investigation. Although Chief Hall (Ret.) was asked to assist in a passive role, Walsh made it clear that he initiated the review and was in charge of the review, not the police department.

During this investigator’s interview with Walsh, Walsh was asked why an internal investigation was not initiated by the police department. He indicated early on, he was not sure how much, if any, culpability may have been associated with the Chief, and Walsh wanted to know if there were any possible improprieties that existed on the part of the department. Once he determined, in all likelihood, that there were no intentional departmental improprieties, Walsh involved Hall.

At the conclusion of the Manager’s Review, McCready was informed on February 1, 2018, that he was not going to be disciplined for failing to send the report to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review. Walsh indicated to this investigator the reason for the review was primarily to determine if discipline would be appropriate. The manager acknowledged looking into McCready’s previous CSC investigations, including Randall’s case, as well as McCready’s work record both previous and subsequent to the Randall investigation. After weighing all factors, a decision was made by Walsh and only him, not to discipline McCready for not sending the report to the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office for review.

No investigation was initiated into Sgt. Spencer’s involvement, or lack of involvement, regarding the disposition of this case and why he never sent the investigation to the prosecutor’s office for review. Although Spencer retired on February 19 2010, there is no doubt he was Detective McCready’s immediate supervisor at the time. Spencer not only assigned the case to McCready he reviewed it and agreed with the disposition to close without further investigation. Spencer was tasked with monitoring...
activities within the bureau, including but not limited to reviewing investigations. He assigned the case after presumably reading it. After McCready investigated Randall’s case, he turned the report into Spencer for his review and approval.

Part of Spencer’s duties as supervisor were to monitor and be involved in what a relatively inexperienced investigator was doing on the case. Police records indicate McCready had only investigated six CSC investigations prior to the Randall case. There is nothing in the report, nor learned as a result of interviews, that suggest there was any communication between McCready and Spencer during the investigation. Realizing Spencer has been retired since February 19, 2010, some six years prior to this issue coming to light in 2016, it is understood that no actions can be taken against him regarding his involvement and handling of the Randall case. In addition, there is no requirement Spencer participate in an interview relative to this investigation.

From all indications, the case reached a dead end when Spencer agreed with McCready’s closing the investigation. From interviews this investigator conducted, although not proven definitively, it is believed that neither Lt. Russell Wolf (Ret.), who was Spencer’s immediate supervisor, nor Chief Hall were ever appraised or briefed on this particular case. Hall stated in his interview that if he had known about this case, he could have “turned it around” by sending it to the prosecutor’s office for review. Lt. Wolf was called and a message was left, asking him to participate in an interview. Lt. Wolf did not return my call; therefore, he was never interviewed.

DID ANYONE HAVE ANY ASSOCIATION WITH LARRY NASSAR PRIOR TO THE INVESTIGATION?

As part of this investigation, both Randall and Township Manager Walsh wanted to know if anyone involved in this investigation had any connection with Larry Nassar prior to this case, thus potentially affecting or influencing the outcome. All who were interviewed were asked if they had ever heard of, knew of, or had any association with Larry Nassar, either personally or professionally, or if any family members knew of him. No one interviewed indicated they ever heard of Larry Nassar prior to this case in 2004.

Summary

In a paragraph prior to listing Randall’s questions, a general statement of concerns was expressed. One of Randall’s goals was to gain an understanding of what transpired in her case so that she could continue her healing process.

The investigation was conducted in a manner that focused on providing answers to Brianne Randall’s unanswered questions. Additionally, this investigator attempted to fill in some gaps related to how and why the initial investigation into Randall’s complaint produced the end result.
It is this investigator's belief, Brianne's questions were answered as a result of this investigation.